

## REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-18, and 20 are in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 20 are in independent form. Claim 4 is amended. The limitations of claims 21-23 are added to claim 20. Claims 21-23 are canceled in this response.

Objection. Claim 4 is amended to add "the" before "source and drain" as suggested.

35 U.S.C. 102. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burr (US 6,100,567).

Claim 1 recites: "wherein the electric field terminal region concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain."

The Office action, p. 3, refers to an electric field terminal region 852 in FIG. 8 of Burr. However, Burr calls it "n+ well 852." Further, nothing in Burr suggests n+ well 852 concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of the channel. Indeed, Burr does not make any mention to electric fields. It is unsupported conjecture to assume that n+ well 852 concentrates electric fields as required by claim 1. The Office action is basically saying concentrating of electric fields is inherent in "n+ well 852." However, there is insufficient evidence for such an inherency assertion. The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) section 2112 (page 2100-57, Rev. 3, August 2005) explains:

"The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. [Cite omitted.] "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." \* \* \*

"In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." (Emphasis in MPEP.)

The standard of evidence required by the MPEP is not met. It is unsupported conjecture to assume that n+ well 852 concentrates electric fields as required by claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 3 should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is amended to recite: "wherein the electric field terminal region concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain."

Claim 4 and dependent claims 7-9, 12, 14-15, and 17 should be allowed for the same reason

as claim 1.

35 U.S.C. 103. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houston (US 6,043,535) in view of Burr (US 6,100,567).

Claim 20 recites: "wherein the electric field terminal region concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain."

As noted above, in connection with claim 1, this is not taught by Burr. Likewise, Houston does not mention anything about electric fields and does not teach an electric field terminal region to concentrate electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel.

Further, the limitations of claims 21-23 are added to claim 20 to create a new combination of limitations.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burr in view of Wu et al. (US 5,976,926). Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 5 is patentable over Burr. Further, Wu et al. also does not teach an "electric field terminal region [that] concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain." Accordingly, claim 5 should be allowed.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burr in view of Hwang (US 5,359,219). Claim 6 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 4 is patentable over Burr. Further, Hwang, also does not teach an "electric field terminal region [that] concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain." Accordingly, claim 6 should be allowed.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burr in view of Burr (US 6,249,027). Claim 10 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 4 is patentable over Burr. Further, Burr ('027) also does not teach an "electric field terminal region [that] concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain." Accordingly, claim 10 should be allowed.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Burr in view of Kumar et al. (US 6,248,626). Claim 11 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 4 is patentable over Burr. Further, Kumar also does not teach an "electric field terminal region [that] concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain." Accordingly, claim 11 should be allowed.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burr in view of

Inoue et al. (US 6,198,134). Claim 13 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 4 is patentable over Burr. Further, Kumar also does not teach an "electric field terminal region [that] concentrates electric fields from the source and drain toward edges of a channel between the source and drain." Accordingly, claim 13 should be allowed.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burr. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 4. For the reasons described above, claim 4 is patentable over Burr. Accordingly, claim 18 also should be allowed.

It is noted that there may be reasons for patentability in addition to those mentioned above.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 2, 2006

/Alan K. Aldous/  
Alan K. Aldous  
Reg. No. 31,905  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
Phone: (503) 264-7125  
Phone: (503) 684-6200  
Phone (310) 207-3800  
Facsimile: (503) 684-3245